

Elected to Congress in 1960, Garner quickly became a close friend and advisor to another famous Kansan—fellow classmate Bob Dole. During his tenure in Congress, Garner became an influential voice on significant issues of the day, including health and education benefits for our nation's veterans, and the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Additionally, Garner effectively combined his political prowess and position on the powerful House Appropriations Committee to make sure Kansas was never overlooked during the federal budget process. And while championing the rights of the average taxpayer, Garner was often heard complaining that members spent "too much of taxpayers' money on junketeering and increased staff."

In addition to being a loyal husband, Garner was a caring and loving father, an honored public servant and a personal friend to thousands of Kansans who, like us, will miss his wit and personal charm. Finally, we wish to recognize, as was noted in his obituary, that Garner viewed public service as a mandate for living a Christian life. We pray that the Lord gives us the same grace he provided Garner during his distinguished public career.

If there is anything we can do to help you during this difficult time, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

SAM BROWNBACK,  
PAT ROBERTS,  
U.S. Senate.  
TODD TIAHRT,  
JERRY MORAN,  
JIM RYUN,  
VINCE SNOWBARGER,  
Members of Congress.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in honoring the memory of former Kansas Congressman Garner Shriver who was sadly taken from us this week. Garner Shriver will always be remembered as one of Kansas' most effective and revered public servants.

Garner served his country as an enlisted man and as an officer in the U.S. Navy during World War II. Upon his return, he served 12 years in the Kansas Legislature and was later elected to serve 8 consecutive terms in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Here in the House of Representatives he quickly became known as a tireless advocate for our nation's veterans and as a thorough legislator who made sure Kansas was never overlooked in needed federal appropriations.

A quiet, thoughtful man, Garner viewed his public service as a Christian duty. In the process, he achieved great legislative successes benefiting both our nation and his home state of Kansas.

Garner Shriver was a skilled political leader who helped shape the attitudes of an entire generation of young Kansans. It is to his credit, that those of us who have gathered here today on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to pay tribute to him were among them.

Our thoughts and prayers go out to his wife, Martha Jane, and their three children, Kay, David, and Linda. Garner Shriver has left a void that will surely be hard to fill.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the tribute to the late Honorable Garner E. Shriver.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

□ 1300

#### CONGRESS HAS AN HISTORIC OPPORTUNITY TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF OUR NATION'S EDUCATION

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 1 minute.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this year the Congress has an historic opportunity to improve the quality of our Nation's education. Teachers are the foundation of our entire educational system, but right now we have a serious problem with the way we prepare and deploy teachers. One in four high school teachers does not even have a college minor in the subject they teach. In high poverty schools, the figure is one in two.

Last week it was reported that U.S. students performed poorly in math and science compared to students in other countries. It is no coincidence that many of these students' teachers have no math or science background. The Committee on Education and the Workforce is about to mark up legislation to upgrade teacher preparation and to attract talented individuals to the profession of teaching.

I will offer my own legislation, H.R. 2228, which would provide for the forgiveness of student loans to qualified entry-level teachers, increase professional development of new teachers, strengthen the standards for federally-supported teacher programs, and require schools to inform parents about the qualifications of their child's teacher.

I support reducing classroom size by hiring more teachers, but when it comes to teachers, more is not enough. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2228.

#### ELIMINATE THE MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to explain why enactment of the Marriage Tax Elimination Act is so important with a series of questions: Do Americans feel that it is fair that our Tax Code imposes a higher tax penalty on marriage? Do Americans feel that it is fair that 21 million married working couples suffer a tax penalty of \$1,400 more in taxes just because they are married? Do Americans feel that it is right that our Tax Code actually provides an incentive to get divorced?

The answer is pretty clear. Not only is the marriage tax penalty unfair, but it is wrong that our Tax Code punishes a married working couple with two incomes with higher taxes than an identical couple that chooses to live together outside of marriage. Twenty-one million married working couples suffer an average marriage tax penalty of \$1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married.

Some would say, why does that happen? Under our current Tax Code, a married working couple with two incomes usually files jointly. When they do, their combined income pushes them into a higher tax bracket.

Let me give an example here of a south suburban couple. I represent the south side of Chicago, the south suburbs in Illinois, as well as a lot of bedroom communities and rural areas. Let me give an example of a couple that lives in Joliet. Say you have a machinist who is working at the Joliet Caterpillar Manufacturing Plant, where they make heavy industrial equipment like bulldozers and cranes and earth movers. This machinist is making \$30,500 a year in average income. If he is single, after standard deductions and exemptions, he is in the 15 percent tax bracket, being taxed at the 15 percent rate.

Say he meets a gal and she is a public school teacher in the Joliet public schools. She has an identical income. This machinist who works the caterpillar and this Joliet public school teacher decide to get married. She has an income of \$30,500 as well. When you combine their income when they file jointly, it produces a \$1,400 average marriage tax penalty. Is that fair, just because this machinist at Caterpillar and this Joliet public school teacher decide to get married, that they should pay higher taxes just because they are married?

I think it is wrong that our Tax Code punishes this machinist and this school teacher. I believe we should make it a priority to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. If we think about it, in Joliet Illinois, in the district I am proud to represent, for this machinist and public schoolteacher, \$1,400 is a lot of money. That is one year's tuition at Joliet Junior College, it is 3 months of day care at a local day care center, it is several months' worth of car payments and a significant portion of a down payment on a new home.

The Marriage Tax Elimination Act, which now has 235 cosponsors, would eliminate the marriage tax penalty and eliminate it now, because we would give married working couples with two incomes the power of choice to choose to file as two singles or jointly, whichever is to their financial advantage.

The bottom line is, each individual, this machinist and this schoolteacher, under the Marriage Tax Elimination Act, would be able to enjoy the lower tax rate and would be at the 15 percent rate, allowing them to keep that \$1,400.